



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/737,346	12/15/2000	Steven Michael French	AUS9-2000-0457-US1	9186
7590	01/05/2004		EXAMINER	
Duke W. Yee, Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP P.O. Box 802334 Dallas, TX 75380			PHILLIPS, HASSAN A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2151	
			DATE MAILED: 01/05/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/737,346	FRENCH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hassan Phillips	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 March 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2 .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on March 26, 2001, has been received, and considered by the examiner.

Drawings

The formal drawings filed on March 16, 2001, have been received, and considered by the examiner.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- a) The pages of the disclosure are not numbered.
- b) It is unclear whether reference numeral 402 is a requesting client, or a server. On page 10, line 5, reference numeral 402 is mentioned as a requesting client. Then, on page 11, lines 12, and 17, reference numeral 402 acts as a server. The examiner suggests that if 402 also acts as a server, that this be mentioned in the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navarre et al. U.S. Patent 6,442,611, and further in view of Wang et al. U.S. Patent 6,119,079.

Regarding claim 1, Navarre et al. discloses a method in a multi-node networked data processing system for receiving results from remotely executed tasks comprising:

- a) receiving, at a first node, first results of execution from a task executed on a second node in the networked data processing system, (col. 3, lines 46-49);
- b) receiving, at a first node, an array of data items (result messages) (col. 4, lines 4-12), sent from a second node;
- c) modifying the result messages to create second results, wherein the second results comprise an array of result messages, (col. 3, lines 55-61);
- d) sending the results to a requesting client, (col. 3, lines 61-64).

Although the disclosed method of Navarre et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to explicitly disclose:

- a) each message having a unique message identifier and associated message text.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor where messages are sent to a requesting client, Wang et al. discloses a method for managing result information comprising:

- a) messages containing unique message identifiers, (col. 2, lines 54-58);
- b) message text content associated with the message identifier, (col. 11, lines 66-67, and col. 12, lines 1-3).

It is well known in the art for messages transmitted in networks to have identifiers associated with them. Given the teachings of Wang et al., it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify the teachings of Navarre et al., with Wang et al., in order to have message identifiers associated with the messages received by the gateway 220. The motivation for doing so would have been to use the message identifiers to index catalog files in order to convert result messages of varying locales to the locale of the requesting client before transferring the result message to the requesting client. Therefore, the claimed invention (claim 1) would have been an obvious modification of the methods disclosed by Navarre et al. in view of Wang et al.

Claims 2, 10-19, 27-36, 44-51, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navarre et al. in view of Wang et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Moharram, U.S. Patent 6,079,036.

In considering claims 2, 10, 11, 18, 19, 27, 28, 35, 36, and 44, 45, Navarre et al. in view of Wang et al. shows substantial features of the claimed inventions as mentioned above. Furthermore, Navarre et al. also discloses:

- a) sending, from a first node, a command request to a second node (col. 2, lines 1-14).

Although the disclosed methods of Navarre et al. in view of Wang et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to explicitly disclose:

- a) a result containing both the program result from one or more of the tasks executed and an array of log messages.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor where test messages are propagated through a telecommunications network, Moharram discloses a format for a result message comprising:

- a) a result containing both the result of a task executed on a second node and an array of log messages, (col. 13, lines 45-54);

Given the teachings of Moharram, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify the teachings of Navarre et al., and Wang et al., with Moharram in order to send result messages together with an array of log messages to a requesting client. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the client with important administrative information together with the results requested by the client. Therefore, the claimed inventions (claims 2, 10, 11, 18, 19, 27, 28, 35, 36, 44 and 45) would have been an obvious

modification of the methods disclosed by Navarre et al. in view of Wang et al., and further in view of Moharram.

In considering claims 12-15, 29-32, 46-49, see Navarre et al. col. 3, lines 55-61. The results returned from server applications are merged at the gateway 220, before being returned to the requesting client. Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to combine the methods of Navarre et al. with Moharram to provide a means for the merged (modified) result to contain none, some, or all of the log messages contained within the original result. The motivation to do so would be to only forward the log messages needed by the requesting client.

In considering claims 16, 33, 50, although the disclosed methods of Navarre et al. in view of Moharram shows substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to explicitly disclose:

- a) translating at least one of the log entries in the set of log entries from a first language into a primary language of the requesting client node if the first language is different from the primary language of the requesting client.

Nevertheless, Wang et al. discloses a method comprising:

- b) translating a log file from a first language on a remote system into a primary language on a local system, (col. 5, lines 24-38);

Given the teachings of Wang et al., it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify the teachings of Navarre et al., and Moharram, with Wang et al. in order to translate log entries into a primary language of the requesting client. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the client with a log file that the client can understand. Therefore, the claimed invention (claims 16, 33, and 50) would have been an obvious modification of the methods disclosed by Navarre et al. in view of Moharram, and further in view of Wang et al.

In considering claims 17, 34, 51, see Wang et al., col. 2, lines 54-67, and col.3, lines 1-9.

Claims 3-9, 20-26, 37-43, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navarre et al. in view of Wang et al., and further in view of Moharram as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Otteson U.S. Patent 5,867,659.

In considering claims 3-9, 20-26, 37-43, although the disclosed methods of Navarre et al. in view of Wang et al., and further in view of Moharram, shows substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to explicitly disclose:

- a) the log entry comprising a system log, a security log, an application log, or a result error message including a severity field indicating the severity of the error.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor where events in a computer system are logged in order for a user to monitor the system, Otteson discloses a method for writing events to a computer system wherein the log entry comprises:

- a) an application, security, and system log entry, (col. 4, lines 59-62);
- b) a result error message including a severity field indicating a severity of the error, wherein the severity field is an informational field, or the severity field is a warning, (col. 5, lines 52-56).

It is well known in the art to have various logs for monitoring and maintaining systems. Given the teachings of Otteson, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify the teachings of Navarre et al., and Wang et al., and Moharram, with Otteson in order to provide a requesting user with important maintenance information about the nodes which are providing a result to the requesting client. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent un-authorized users from using the remote applications and systems and to assure that the applications and systems are performing correctly in supplying the result information, and if not so, providing an error message including reasons why not. Therefore, the claimed inventions (claims 3-9, 20-26, 37-43) would have been an obvious modification of the methods disclosed by Navarre et al. in view of Wang et al., and further in view of Moharram, and further in view of Otteson.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Navarre et al., U.S. Patent 6,442,611 discloses a system and method for remotely executing a request from a client application.

Wang et al., U.S. Patent 6,119,079 discloses a method for translating log messages into a preferred native language.

Moharram, U.S. Patent 6,079,036 discloses a method for transmitting a message with an associated log.

Otteson, U.S. Patent 5,867,659 discloses a method and apparatus for monitoring events in a system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (703) 305-8760. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-7201.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


FRANTZ B. JEAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

hp
12/17/03